

AFFIDAVIT

The undersigned, Robert D. Bradshaw, hereby certifies and affirms that the attached copies of letters from me were mailed by me to the CNMI Attorney General on or about the dates indicated and as relative to service on Superior Court Case 96-1320:

1. Letter of Jan 31, 1997, to D. Douglas Cotton, stating that I had not been served and asserting that I would not authorize the CNMI AG to accept service on my behalf.
2. Letter of Jun 2, 1997, to D. Douglas Cotton, asserting that I had not been served by Bisom and that I had not authorized the AG to accept service for me.
3. Letter of Jul 14, 1999, to William C. Bush, in response to his letter of Jun 30, 1999, and asserting by me that I had never been served in the Civil Case No. 96-1320, that I had not authorized the AG to accept service for me.
4. Undated letter, to William C. Bush, in response to his letter of Jun 30, 1999, and further answering his questions in his June 30, 1999 to me. Though undated, this letter probably was dated around Jul. 20, 1999 in that the next letter was an essential repeat of this undated letter.
5. Letter of Jul. 20, 1999, to William C. Bush, in response to his letter of Jun 30, 1999, and further answering his questions to me in his June 30, 1999 letter.
6. Letter of Jul 16, 2000 to the CNMI Attorney General indicating that I had not been served and that I had not and was not authorizing the AG to represent me on service.

Dated at St. Maries, Idaho, this 7th day of August 2005

Robert D. Bradshaw
Robert D. Bradshaw

STATE OF IDAHO
COUNTY OF BENEWAH

I, Jerry Lee Nelson, Notary in and for the State of Idaho,
residing at St. Maries, Idaho do hereby certify that on this
9 day of August 2005, personally appeared


(17)¹

B

before me Robert D. Bradshaw, to me known to be the individual described in and who executed the within instrument for the uses and purposes herein mentioned.

Given Under My hand and Official Seal; this 9 day of August 2005.


NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF IDAHO



MY APPOINTMENT EXPIRES

11/15/07

(18)

MR. DOUG COTTON
ASST. AG, COTTON

Dear Doug:

Reference your letter of Jan. 22, 1997 ref to
Rison vs COTTON. My answers are
as follows:

- ① I have not been served with
this summons.
- ② I am not a resident of the
COTTON. They have NO jurisdiction
over me - Do they ??
- ③ I will not authorize the COTTON
to accept service for me at this time.
- ④ I will not release my claims
while I believe advised you of -
As I remember I am due some
\$130 for my expenses.
- ⑤ Last, if I can help on anything,
Please advise me, I have no
telephone. Thanks.

Regards

Robert D. Bradburn
40203 N. NEWPORT HI.
ELK, WA 99009

(19)

June 2, 1997

Mr Douglas Cotton, Asst AG
 Office of the Attorney General
 Admin Bldg, Capitol Hill, Caller Box 1007
 Saipan, MP 96950

Dear Doug:

As of today, I have not been served with Bisom's latest action. I do expect that it will come with a process server in a few days. I had a certified letter from Sorenson at the Post Office which was unclaimed by me and returned to him. He should have it returned by now so I suspect he will have to hire a process server which I guess he will. On receipt of service I will notify you.

You know every thing I know on this so you can respond. I do not have a telephone and won't have one. I will try to find a commercial fax number you can use to ask me any questions. In the meantime, several concerns are floating around in my mind which I now pose to you.

True, I did accept mail service on the original case CV 95-0042 filed in federal court in 1995. I have never been served with any other summons since then nor have I authorized you to accept any service on my behalf.

I believe that this original was dismissed in Dec 1996 at which time, Bisom or Sorenson filed it in CNMI Superior Court. I was not served with this action. Evidently, it was later refiled in federal court. I was not served with that one. Now its back to Superior Court and I expect that I MIGHT get served with this one as they have evidently tried the mails but the summons went back unclaimed.

Several questions now surface. First, there is a CMNI statute of limitations on this. I guess its three years which means it expired in December 1996 (my termination letter?). Maybe the original complaint's life was kept alive with the Federal dismissal but the subsequent lack of service on me suggests that if there was any basis to extend the statute of limitations, surely it has expired. In other words, there has been two complete breaks in this case to me since I was not a party to the December 1996 (Possibly 96-1320?) action filed in Superior Court. I was not a party to the subsequent filing in Federal court.

Even if there was a basis to keep this thing alive, surely it has long since expired because complaints have to be served in 120 days in federal court. I don't know what the CMNI service date requirements are but they surely don't exceed the 120 days. So from the Dec 1995 dismissal, more than 150 days have passed. It plainly looks like any linkage I had with the old case is now broke. Time has dragged by and now far exceeds the statute of limitations. I don't see how that they can keep pushing me on this thing.

Last, I don't know what Sorenson's current complaint says but I do have a copy of the perhaps first one he filed in Superior Court (96-1320 but I thought this was filed in 1996?). You sent me a copy with your Jan 22, 1997 letter letting me know that I could expect service (which never

(20)

happened- my last action "to" Bisom was in December 1993 and late Dec on his termination as I best recall).

In looking over this 96-1320 complaint (which was possibly filed after the statute of limitations expired), its quite evident that Bison/Sorenson is broaching new complaints never filed against me which certainly had no life or basis from the federal action filed in 1995. In other words, they had no life for a carryover.

For example, the claims and complaints concerned my alleged violations of Commonwealth law (but I don't understand the Civil rights ones citing 42 USC 1983) and filed in Superior Ct based on Commonwealth law and jurisdiction. These claims had no life or basis in the 1995 federal lawsuit (unless it be the civil rights ones which I don't understand). The statute of limitations has long since expired and now they are placing them in court. I have real problems with this from the standpoint of justice.

Too, there are the issues you raised in your letter to Sorenson on Dec 1996. Please let me know about this. I will do the best I can when I am served. I will notify you immediately (I will call you collect). I am retired living on Social Security. I have no funds for telephone calls and fax charges. Again, I will not relinquish my claims for costs (around \$130 or so - \$50 additional plus the \$80 I did not receive from the deposition). Best wishes. Please advise me of any questions.

Bob Bradshaw
Bob Bradshaw
40203 N. Newport Hwy
Elk, WA 99009

uly 14, 1999

CNMI Attorney General, ATTN. William C Bush
Saipan, CM 96950

Dear Mr Bush:

Thank you for your letter of Jun 30, 1999, just recently received by me. In 1995, I was a party to the US District Court Case 95-0042, after service. I made an answer to this complaint in 1995 and gave it to the CNMI AG. I was never furnished a copy of what answer was filed but I assume that whoever made the answer filed what I sent Saipan. In the answer I said that I never knew that Bisom was a Jew before the complaint. Recently, I have learned that the US District Court decision was upheld by the Appeals Court in a 1998 decision (according to the local Clerk of Court of the District Court in Saipan).

Regarding CNMI SC 96-1320 and all subsequent complaints, I have never been served on any of these complaints. I have never authorized the AG to accept service for me. As far as I am concerned those cases are all mute and non-existent. To repeat, I don't want the AG to accept service for me on anything. If Bisom wishes to sue me, he must serve me (actually with a process server).

Some two certified mail packets from an unidentified party came to me from Saipan in 1996 and 1997. I refused to accept either of them and they were returned by the Post Office undelivered. Possibly these mailings were an attempt to accomplish service although I cannot be sure what were in the packets and the sender's name was not identified (beyond a return address post office box). Again, if Bisom wants an answer from me he will have to hire a process server. As I said to Doug Cotton, if I am served I will contact the AG to make the answer. Otherwise, I have not authorized the AG to make any answers for me on anything in the CNMI cases. And I have never been served!

As far as constructive service, I have no knowledge of any attempts by anyone to serve papers on me. I live by myself and there is no one at my house except me. I have no employees or anyone else present who could accept service on my behalf. I don't have any reason to believe that Bisom can come up with any basis of service. If he attempts it, surely it would constitute some type of a fraud. If he produces a signature, it is not mine.

I assume that the CNMI has a cut off date for service like the 180 days or so for the feds. Surely, we are long past that date whatever it is. Couple that with the statute of limitations and I see no way that I am a part of the CNMI case. Should you file a motion to strike my name individually from the suit? Since you have

22

suggested it, it seems like a good idea although I don't know that it is necessary other than if this thing goes to trial and Bisom tries to later claim service on me; thus, a pre-trial motion as you suggest would flush out whatever case he might try to make).

Accordingly, if you wish to file a motion to have me removed individually from the CNMI case, you have my permission and agreement. If you don't feel that such a motion will benefit your case, fine and I understand. There is a possibility that Bisom's lawyer may have "mistakenly" thought he made service on this and has neglected to verify the fact. He may not really know about the lack of service. I suppose for this reason, I have never been anxious to bring the matter up (thus letting him stay in the dark).

As far as me cooperating with you, I feel that I have went the extra mile to cooperate with the AG on this case. If you have knowledge otherwise, please advise me as I would like to hear about it.

Since the Fed case is now history, I don't see that I have any role in anything further. However, I am anxious to help you and the CNMI case in any way possible. In that sense, I will supply whatever information I can. If the case goes to trial and you wish me to come to Saipan, I would consider it. In saying this I would want something more firm on my expenses than how Cotton handled the situation for me for the Spokane deposition some years ago. I lived in Idaho, several hundred miles from Spokane. I agreed to come to Spokane or Boise if Bisom would pay my expenses. Cotton (without consulting me) agreed with Bisom on this deposition with a \$25 a day or so motel bill limit (I now have forgotten the amount but it was not enough) which was ridiculous so I ended up never even being completely reimbursed by Bisom for my expenses. I sent Doug a bill to include the ~~unreimbursed~~ costs in the 95-0042 case (which Bisom is supposed to pay).

Should you represent me further? Again, I don't think I am a party to that CNMI case and if that is true, the answer is no (if the answer is yes then of course I would need representation; although I cannot perceive how it could be yes). I suppose if Bisom appealed the Circuit Court decision to the Supreme Court, I will continue to need help on the 95-0042 case. As far as the CNMI SC, your office has never and should never have represented me on this at all that I am aware of. As I was never served, I never asked for any assistance and the CNMI SC never should have been told that the AG represents me. Hence, why is there now a need to contact them to have the AG withdrawn as my attorney?

The Jew question - I know some very good Jews and indeed some very bad Jews (like Bisom if he is a Jew and I still don't know that fact). There was never any

63

reason for me to know that Bisom was a Jew since he never said that to me. And certainly he is not a religious Jew (religious Jews wear breads and he always was clean shaven). Otherwise, he looked like a majority type white and his name was no clue for anything.

In Bisom's deposition, he claims that he deceptively entered into Guy Gabaldon's confidence and found out that I sent Guy some alleged "anti-Semitic" literature from the US and that I fired Bisom because he was a Jew. All of this probably didn't come from Gabaldon although I allow that Bisom fraudulently and deceptively tried to manipulate something out of Gabaldon to claim that I am anti-Semitic to justify his lawsuit.

Gabaldon and I have been friends for 20 years. It is true that Guy has had some bad experiences with some Saipan Jews (particularly a liberal reporter who was very hostile to Gabaldon). After I came back to the states in 1994, I mailed some copies of a newsletter complaining about the Jewish lobby and how they are able to walk into Washington and get anything they want free for the state of Israel.

The newsletter was put out from Washington DC by Victor Marchetti, a former official with the CIA in the Director's office. Marchetti is a well known personality, having been on TV several times on discussions about the CIA. He put out this newsletter as a Washington watch and I have forgotten what the name is. Perhaps his letter was a little pro-Arab although I am not sure. In any case, he did do a good job of reporting on the flow of money (\$5 billion annually), airplanes, technology, wealth and you name it to Israel - sometimes illegally and without Congressional authorization.

Frankly, I practice Judaism and am more anxious to see Israel built up (even at the expense of the stupid US taxpayers) as much as probably anyone in America. I did send some of this stuff from Marchetti to Gabaldon but none of it was Jew hatred stuff. It was only a complaint about the incompetence and stupidity of American officials that have given the wealth of this nation away all over the world. I learned long ago that this stupidity was not about to end because it has happened all over the world in the last 50 years.

In any case, this seems to be the basis for Bisom to bring his lawsuit and charge discrimination because he is allegedly a Jew. But all Jewish authorities (and I have had some three different Jewish Encyclopedias plus access to other authoritative sources) agree that there is no Jewish race. I agree with this. There is a Jewish religion which I willingly try to practice. But again, Bisom is certainly no religious Jew as is plainly evident when looking at him. In order to determine how deceptive Bisom was with Gabaldon, you will have to call Gabaldon and talk with him. He is well known and respected by many on Saipan. As far as I know,

ne has never been deposed so Bisom ~~must~~ realize that he is on thin ice with lying about Gabaldon.

Reaching me? I live in the backwoods and at the moment it is impossible beyond this post office address. I might perhaps get you a fax number of a neighbour if it is needed. You should know that once your office (the AG) has my address, phone number or whatever, Bisom's lawyer also has it if he wants it. Local secretaries do trade information between each other. For example, I moved in '96 and was sure Bisom didn't have my new address (to serve me if he chose). Sure enough, he (or his secretary) seems to have gotten it - evidently from the AG's office (although he did not serve me). So if you need a fax number, I will request that only you have it.

Last, I am not trying to tell or suggest anything to you or your office on this case beyond my deposition, the above remarks and previous correspondence. However, my gut feeling is that Bisom wants to settle this thing short of a trial. He has requested a jury trial which my guess is would be disastrous for him. Bisom has no friends that I know of on Saipan. None of the political factions like him so when he went before the jury, he would largely face enemies.

Ray Guerreo is a local politician with pull with Teno. Ray really hates Bisom. SO if you want an ally to try to find out Bisom's problems and skullduggery, call Ray. He likely would help you in anyway possible and it is plausible that Ray may know something that would be detrimental to Bisom. You can read my files and see where Bisom crossed Ray by going on TV to make charges that were improper from the Auditor's office.

Finally, in closing, may I point out that I have essentially never been furnished by the AG any of these CNMI motions, filings, etc, etc. I did receive copies of the first two or so in 1996 but none of the more recent ones were sent me - perhaps because I was not served and was not a party to them. I do know that Bisom changed some of the complaints between 95-0042 and the few later ones which I saw. For example, he deleted the reference to the Jewish religion and substituted Jewish race (which as I said, does not exist in fact). I have assumed that Cotton or someone in the AG's office would carefully go over each petition to note any discrepancies from former petitions. Please let me know if I can help you further and the final results of this case.

Yours very truly,


Robert D. Bradshaw, Box 3590, Oldtown, ID 83822

25

CNMI Attorney General, ATTN.: William C. Bush
Saipan, CM 96950

Dear Mr Bush.

Doug Cotton was able to piece together the events of 1993 which precipitated the Bisom lawsuit. Possibly you too have time to go through the thousands of pages of documents, depositions, etc and have attained some perspective of what happened. Anyway, I have prepared a synopsis of what happened to assist you.

In 1993, Larry Guerrero was the Republican Governor running for re-election. He was opposed by Democrat Froylan Tenorio. The campaign was bitter and hard. Scott Tan was Public Auditor but his tenure was up around Nov 21st, 1993. Bisom was hired by Tan as the legal counsel for the Public Auditor. Ray Guerrero was one of Larry's principle political allies and Director of CUC. I was a minor employee of the Dept of Finance.

Scott had not gotten along with Larry's administration and rumors abounded that the republicans would not reappoint him Public Auditor. However, at some point of time, Scott was led to believe (as he later orally confirmed with me) that Froylan would reappoint him if he won.

Froylan made Ray Guerrero his principle target - claiming that Ray was a crook and violating numerous CNMI laws. Just before the election, Scott and Bisom came on Saipan TV to confirm that Ray indeed was guilty of the allegations made by Froylan. For whatever reason, Bisom did most of the talking on TV.

In any case, this act violated the PA's law and made all of the Republicans furious. No way would they allow Scott to be reappointed. According to Scott (in later remarks to me), Froylan said that he would appoint Scott using temporary appointments. In the meantime, Scott laid on and arranged for the annual commonwealth audit in late Nov 1993, using the CPA firm of Deloitte and Touche.

In early Nov, Larry lost and Froylan was the Governor elect. He promptly established a transition committee to plan on who would get what jobs in his new administration in Jan 1994. Around the middle of Nov, Froylan and Scott left together for a trip to Hong Kong, ostensibly on Commonwealth business. However, for this trip, Scott must have forgotten that his term would be up around Nov 21.

So, Scott's term was up and Governor Guerrero appointed me temporary Public Auditor. I was never a candidate for the permanent job and understood from Scott that Froylan would appoint him in Jan. Scott and I were then friends.

(26)

My appointment letter was on a Friday and I first came to the office the next Monday. Larry made a press release on it at once so Bisom (who Scott had left in charge of the office) learned that Friday that Scott's term was up and I was the temporary auditor. Bisom immediately called Scott in Hong Kong to brief him on what had happened. Scott consulted with Froylan and they decided that they did not want the CNMI audit scheduled in late Nov to take place. Actually, they wanted to delay it until Jan so that Scott could supervise it after he was reappointed.

In that telephone conversation or another one that weekend, Bisom was instructed to stop the audit at all costs and to go to Froylan's transition committee and coordinate his actions with them. In Bisom's complaint, he confirms the telephone calls and his meetings with the transition committee. He claims that they said that if he was fired for interfering in my work, he would be rehired in Jan when Froylan and Scott came on board.

Unbeknown to me, I came to work that Monday morning not understanding that Bisom (who I thought was my legal counsel) was involved in a conspiracy with Scott, Froylan and the transition committee to sabotage, undercut and hurt my work as public auditor. That Monday, I decided on proceeding with the audit as scheduled by Scott. I detected that Bisom was angry and tried in some ways to interfere in my decision. At that time, I never connected Bisom's opposition to me back to Scott and Froylan - although I became aware of it in a few days.

In the meantime, I, assuming that Bisom was now my "loyal" and trustworthy employee, talked to him privately and outlined a legal problem which I believed needed some attention from the AG. I ordered him to contact the AG and discuss my problem. Well, he never contacted the AG, instead, he contacted Stanley Torres, an opponent of Larry, at the Legislature and briefed him on my privileged conversation in the auditor's office (as he confirmed at his deposition with Cotton). Either he or Torres went to the paper with my legal problem. I knew at once that it came from Bisom because no one else knew of it.

I was only in Bisom's presence a few hours the first day I was in the office. the next day, he was gone most of the time (revealing public auditor information and my privileged conversation) at the legislature, possibly with the media and involved in strategy meetings with Froylan's transition committee on how he was going to stop and disrupt my work at the auditor's office.

All of these Bisom meetings were secret and clandestine and without my knowledge or authorization. After these secret meetings to conspire against me, I never saw Bisom again. He never returned to the office. He did bring a car by

A handwritten signature or mark, appearing to be a stylized 'T' or 'D' with a loop, located at the bottom of the page.

and turned it in one day at noon but I was at lunch. I considered his action an abandonment of his job.

Within two days, I realized that I had a problem with Bisom - that he was disloyal, that he was violating PA rules and laws, that he was secretly working against me. I immediately gave him a 30 day notice of termination (which would be effective in early Jan 1994) without cause as allowed in his contract.

In the meantime, I discovered that Scott had a secret slush fund in his office which I thought was illegal. I closed it and turned the money into the CNMI treasurer and notified the Federal Comptroller if they wanted to audit it. Later, Scott and Froylan returned to Saipan. Whereas Scott and I had been friends, he became my enemy when he learned of my actions on the illegal slush fund.

During the month of Dec, Froylan, Scott and Bisom all three went to the media and constantly attacked me for doing the annual audit which I had proceeded with. I built a paperwork case for the termination of Bisom for cause which I did in late Dec giving him a 7 day notice. If the court should find that this termination was wrong, then surely it must be acknowledged that my earlier 30 day termination without cause would have taken effect. In either case, Bisom was gone!

Naturally, I filed a series of ethics complaints with the local Bar Association on Bisom's many actions. This group is a total joke on Saipan. And I suppose I knew that they would do nothing (they never have except in one rare case where a local lawyer was caught outright in a felony).

In Jan, my temporary appointment was up around the 20th. Froylan was sworn in I think on the 10th. I had to have an emergency operation (which I had in Eugene, OR) so I left in early Jan on sick leave (leaving the senior auditor in charge of the office). Once Froylan was Governor, Scott came to the office and took over (frankly, I believe illegally since I was still technically the temporary Public Auditor). Scott quickly brought Bisom back on board - apparently as he had promised Bisom (per Bisom's allegation).

Whether Froylan ever intended on hiring Bisom back or not, I cannot say. Possibly he planned on double crossing Bisom from day one. Or maybe he did plan on hiring Bisom back or giving him another job (like maybe being the CNMI AG or deputy AG). After his work for Froylan, Bisom perhaps expected a payback in some fashion in the context of a future, well paying, do-nothing job.

But Bisom had made many, many enemies among local people (actually of all political factions). Most people thought he was a bum or had problems of some sort. For certain, Froylan and his administration decided in early Jan that they

28

didn't want Bisom under any condition. So Bisom was not hired. And since he, as a lawyer, knew and understood that job promises mean little or nothing until the contract is finalized and signed by all parties, there was no reason for him to believe he had anything firm.

Scott soon got into trouble with Froylan's administration when he allegedly allowed a Chinese friend to have one of the public auditor's cars. The police found out and he was charged with a criminal act. Froylan then removed him and hired another auditor. The legal counsel position was filled with someone else.

Apparently in 1994, Bisom realized that he had been fired from a \$45,000 a year job (where he apparently had little to do but show up daily) and instead of being appropriately rewarded, he got nothing. SO he proceeded with his lawsuit. And I applaud him for laying out his secret conspiracy with Scott, Froylan and the transition committee to undercut, sabotage and hurt me. I knew this stuff was going on but it's hard to prove secret clandestine meetings and agreements. Bisom has laid it out in his complaint.

Sometime in 94-95, Bisom went to Gabaldon. In a clandestine and deceptive act (without revealing who he was and what he was after), he told Gabaldon some things to make Guy take him into some confidence. Apparently, in their conversations, Gabaldon mentioned that I had mailed some of Victor Marchetti's newsletters (on the US money give away to Israel) to Gabaldon in 94, long after Bisom was fired. Bisom revealed this in his deposition. In any case, he used it as some alleged proof that I had discriminated against him for being a Jew.

The truth is that I didn't know he was a Jew in 93 and if I would have known, it would have made no difference whatsoever in my actions in firing him. The evidence seems to be that he is a liar, cheat, dishonest, disloyal bum and should be fired. I was only in his presence a few hours on the first day that I met him. Beyond what happened that day and the next one, I knew he was a problem.

A final note - I think my action and the action of the government in firing Bisom for cause was absolutely proper. I have real questions about the role of Scott, Bisom and Froylan in the conspiracy which he admits and outlines in his complaint. If the AG defends me and the government, is there any sense or conflict in also defending Scott and Froylan? Obviously, when Froylan was Governor, there was no need in asking that question. Best wishes,

Bob Brannaw, Box 3590, Oldtown, ID 83822



uly 20, 1999

CNMI Attorney General, A.I.I.N.: William C. Bush
Saipan, CM 96950

Dear Mr. Bush.

sent you the essence of this letter a few days ago. Because mail does get lost to Saipan, I wished to send another copy. Also, may I suggest that by means you should read all the letters sent Bisom in connection with his dismissal and all the letters I filed with the local Bar Association on the ethics complaint. Not only did Bisom go out of his way to hurt my work and attack me, but he even telephoned Michael Johnson of Deloitte & Touche to threaten him over the audit he was doing.

The whole bit about discrimination is something for politically correct liberals to jump on in our modern warped society. Bisom was fired for the reasons outlined in the various communications to him. He was fired because I believed he was a dud and was absolutely no good as an employee. Obviously, in Jan 1994, the people in authority in the CNMI believed the same thing because they refused to hire him back.

The modern politically correct thing to do if one can claim discrimination is to never deal with the facts and truth of why the firing took place. instead, one can shift the argument and focus away from the true facts and focus an attack upon the party citing the facts. Slick Clinton is a master of deception and has followed this practice for years in his dealings with his opponents (as you may or may not agree). In other words, attack the attacker and never address the complaints and charges. Bisom did this. Rather than deal with what a dud he was and how sorry he was as an employee, he cooked up this anti-Jew stuff to charge me with discrimination.

And naturally, many gullible people will totally ignore the huge assortment of reasons on why he was fired and instead focus upon the alleged discrimination (I am still not convinced that he is a Jew because most Jews have got some brains and I wonder about Bisom and as I noted earlier, he clearly is not religious). Otherwise, the following letter is a duplicate of what I sent you two days ago. The following dates were recorded off the top of my head and are approximate only.

To repeat:

Doug Cotton was able to piece together the events of 1993 which precipitated the Bisom lawsuit. Possibly you too have time to go through the thousands of pages of documents, depositions, etc and have attained some perspective of what happened. Anyway, I have prepared a synopsis of what happened to assist you.

In 1993, Larry Guerrero was the Republican Governor running for re-election. he was opposed by Democrat Froylan Tenorio. The campaign was bitter and hard. Scott Tan was Public Auditor but his tenure was up around Nov 21st, 1993. Bisom was hired by Tan as the legal counsel for the Public Auditor. Ray Guerrero was one of Larry's principle political allies and Director of CUC. I was a minor employee of the Dept of Finance.

Scott had not gotten along with Larry's administration and rumors abounded that the Republicans would not reappoint him Public Auditor. However, at some point of time, Scott was led to believe (as he later orally confirmed with me) that Froylan would reappoint him if he won.

Froylan made Ray Guerrero his principle target - claiming that Ray was a crook and violating numerous CNMI laws. Just before the election, Scott and Bisom came on Saipan TV to confirm that Ray indeed was guilty of the allegations made by Froylan. For whatever reason, Bisom did most of the talking on TV.

In any case, this act violated the PA's law and made all of the Republicans furious. No way would they allow Scott to be reappointed. According to Scott (in later remarks to me), Froylan said that he would appoint Scott using temporary appointments. In the meantime, Scott laid off and arranged for the annual commonwealth audit in late Nov 1993, using the CPA firm of Deloitte and Touche.

In early Nov, Larry lost and Froylan was the Governor elect. He promptly established a transition committee to plan on who would get what jobs in his new administration in Jan 1994. Around the middle of Nov, Froylan and Scott left together for a trip to Hong Kong, ostensibly on Commonwealth business. However, for this trip, Scott must have forgotten that his term would be up around Nov 21.

So, Scott's term was up and Governor Guerrero appointed me temporary Public Auditor. I was never a candidate for the permanent job and understood from Scott that Froylan would appoint him in Jan. Scott and I were then friends.

My appointment letter was on a Friday and I first came to the office the next Monday. Larry made a press release on it at once so Bisom (who Scott had left in charge of the office) learned that Friday that Scott's term was up and I was the temporary auditor. Bisom immediately called Scott in Hong Kong to brief him on what had happened. Scott consulted with Froylan and they decided that they did not want the CNMI audit scheduled in late Nov to take place. Actually, they wanted to delay it until Jan so that Scott could supervise it after he was reappointed.

In that telephone conversation or another one that weekend, Bisom was instructed to stop the audit at all costs and to go to Froylan's transition committee and coordinate his actions with them. In Bisom's complaint, he confirms the telephone calls and his meetings with the transition committee. He claims that they said that if he was fired for interfering in my work, he would be rehired in Jan when Froylan and Scott came on board.

Unbeknown to me, I came to work that Monday morning not understanding that Bisom (who I thought was my legal counsel) was involved in a conspiracy with Scott, Froylan and the transition committee to sabotage, undercut and hurt my work as public auditor. That Monday, I decided on proceeding with the audit as scheduled by Scott. I detected that Bisom was angry and tried in some ways to interfere in my decision. At that time, I never connected Bisom's opposition to me back to Scott and Froylan - although I became aware of it in a few days.

In the meantime, I, assuming that Bisom was now my "loyal" and trustworthy employee, talked to him privately and outlined a legal problem which I believed needed some attention from the AG. I ordered him to contact the AG and discuss my problem. Well, he never contacted the AG, instead, he contacted Stanley Torres, an opponent of Larry, at the Legislature and briefed him on my privileged conversation in the auditor's office (as he confirmed at his deposition with Cotton). Either he or Torres went to the paper with my legal problem. I knew at once that it came from Bisom because no one else knew of it.

I was only in Bisom's presence a few hours the first day I was in the office. the next day, he was gone most of the time (revealing public auditor information and my privileged conversation) at the legislature, possibly with the media and involved in strategy meetings with Froylan's transition committee on how he was going to stop and disrupt my work at the auditor's office.

All of these Bisom meetings were secret and clandestine and without my knowledge or authorization. After these secret meetings to conspire against me, I never saw Bisom again. He never returned to the office. He did bring a car by and turned it in one day at noon but I was at lunch. I considered his action an abandonment of his job.

Within two days, I realized that I had a problem with Bisom - that he was disloyal, that he was violating PA rules and laws, that he was secretly working against me. I immediately gave him a 30 day notice of termination (which would be effective in early Jan 1994) without cause as allowed in his contract.

In the meantime, I discovered that Scott had a secret slush fund in his office which I thought was illegal. I closed it and turned the money into the CNMI treasurer and notified the Federal Comptroller if they wanted to audit it. Later, Scott and Froylan returned to Saipan. Whereas Scott and I had been friends, he became my enemy when he learned of my actions on the illegal slush fund.

During the month of Dec, Froylan, Scott and Bisom all three went to the media and constantly attacked me for doing the annual audit which I had proceeded with. I built a paperwork case for the termination of



Bisom for cause which I did in late Dec giving him a 7 day notice. If the court should find that this termination was wrong, then surely it must be acknowledged that my earlier 30 day termination without cause would have taken effect. In either case, Bisom was gone!

Naturally, I filed a series of ethics complaints with the local Bar Association on Bisom's many actions. This group is a total joke on Saipan. And I suppose I knew that they would do nothing (they never have except in one rare case where a local lawyer was caught outright in a felony).

In Jan, my temporary appointment was up around the 20th. Froylan was sworn in I think on the 10th. I had to have an emergency operation (which I had in Eugene, OR) so I left in early Jan on sick leave (leaving the senior auditor in charge of the office). Once Froylan was Governor, Scott came to the office and took over (frankly, I believe illegally since I was still technically the temporary Public Auditor). Scott quickly brought Bisom back on board - apparently as he had promised Bisom (per Bisom's allegation).

Whether Froylan ever intended on hiring Bisom back or not, I cannot say. Possibly he planned on double crossing Bisom from day one. Or maybe he did plan on hiring Bisom back or giving him another job (like maybe being the CNMI AG or deputy AG). After his work for Froylan, Bisom perhaps expected a payback in some fashion in the context of a future, well paying, do-nothing job.

But Bisom had made many, many enemies among local people (actually of all political factions). Most people thought he was a bum or had problems of some sort. For certain, Froylan and his administration decided in early Jan that they didn't want Bisom under any condition. So Bisom was not hired. And since he, as a lawyer, knew and understood that job promises mean little or nothing until the contract is finalized and signed by all parties, there was no reason for him to believe he had anything firm.

Scott soon got into trouble with Froylan's administration when he allegedly allowed a Chinese friend to have one of the public auditor's cars. The police found out and he was charged with a criminal act. Froylan then removed him and hired another auditor. The legal counsel position was filled with someone else.

Apparently in 1994, Bisom realized that he had been fired from a \$45,000 a year job (where he apparently had little to do but show up daily) and instead of being appropriately rewarded, he got nothing. SO he proceeded with his lawsuit. And I applaud him for laying out his secret conspiracy with Scott, Froylan and the transition committee to undercut, sabotage and hurt me. I knew this stuff was going on but it's hard to prove secret clandestine meetings and agreements. Bisom has laid it out in his complaint.

Sometime in 94-95, Bisom went to Gabaldon. In a clandestine and deceptive act (without revealing who he was and what he was after), he told Gabaldon some things to make Guy take him into some confidence. Apparently, in their conversations, Gabaldon mentioned that I had mailed some of Victor Marchetti's newsletters (on the US money give away to Israel) to Gabaldon in 94, long after Bisom was fired. Bisom revealed this in his deposition. In any case, he used it as some alleged proof that I had discriminated against him for being a Jew.

The truth is that I didn't know he was a Jew in 93 and if I would have known, it would have made no difference whatsoever in my actions in firing him. The evidence seems to be that he is a liar, cheat, dishonest, disloyal bum and should be fired. I was only in his presence a few hours on the first day that I met him. Beyond what happened that day and the next one, I knew he was a problem.

A final note - I think my action and the action of the government in firing Bisom for cause was absolutely proper. I have real questions about the role of Scott, Bisom and Froylan in the conspiracy which he admits and outlines in his complaint. If the AG defends me and the government, is there any sense or conflict in also defending Scott and Froylan? Obviously, when Froylan was Governor, there was no need in asking that question. Best wishes,

Bob Bradshaw

Bob Bradshaw, Box 3590, Midtown, IL 83822

32

July 15, 2000

CNMI Attorney General
Saipan, CM 96950

Gentlemen:


Over a year ago, William C. Bush of your office and I exchanged letters on the CNMI Superior Court Case 96-1320. Mr Bush suggested that he might go into Superior Court and have my name removed from 96-1320 because I was never served with the lawsuit.

I indicated that I was not served and that I knew of no reason at all which would allow any alleged constructive service (I have no employees or family members who could have accepted service). Furthermore, I have authorized no one on Saipan to accept service for me. This includes the AG's office as I had told Doug Cotton that neither he or anyone else there could accept service for me. Risom must serve me personally if he wants to pursue this case with me!

Since I was not served, I agreed with Mr Bush that it would be well to go into court and have my name stricken. Frankly, I thought he would do that. But now over a year has passed and I have had no further communication from Mr Bush. Perhaps he is no longer with your office.

In any case, I am wondering what the status of 96-1320 is and did Mr Bush go into court and follow his suggestion to me on removing my name from the suit? Your help will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,


Robert D. Bradshaw
PO Box 3590
Oldtown, ID 83822

33